

SHERIFF OF COOK COUNTY,)
)
vs.)
) Docket # 1761
TOCCARRA WILSON,)
Correctional Officer,)
Employee # [REDACTED])
Star #8661.)

THIS MATTER COMING ON to be heard pursuant to notice before Jennifer E. Bae, a Board Member, and the Cook County Sheriff's Merit Board finds as follows:

1. Toccarrá Wilson (herein after "Respondent") holds a position as a Correctional Officer which involves duties and responsibilities to the public.
2. Each member of the Cook County Sheriff's Merit Board (hereinafter "Board") has been duly appointed to serve as a member of the Board pursuant to confirmation by the Cook County Board of Commissioners, State of Illinois, to sit for a stated term.
3. The Board has jurisdiction of the subject matter of the parties in accordance with Chapter 55 of the Illinois Compiled Statutes.
4. The Respondent was personally served with a copy of the Complaint and Notice of Hearing and appeared before the Board to contest the charges contained in the complaint.
5. The Board has heard the evidence presented by the Sheriff and the Respondent, and evaluated the credibility of the witnesses and supporting documents.

By complaint dated April 18, 2014, Sheriff Thomas J. Dart, sought the termination of the Respondent. The complaint alleges that Respondent violated CCDOC policies regarding detainee [REDACTED] personal property which resulted in \$30.00 discrepancy in detainee's trust fund account in violation of Rules and Regulations and General Orders of the Cook County Department of Corrections and Cook County Sheriff's Department Merit Board Rules and Regulations, specifically:

GENERAL ORDER 2.3

INMATE TRUST FUND ACCOUNTING, in its entirety, including but not limited to the following subparts:

II. PROCEDURE

E. Requirements

1. Upon admission, the designated intake employee shall collect and secure all cash, checks, and personal property for each inmate.
 - a. All cash and person property is to be recorded on the pre-numbered triplicate intake receipt form for each inmate admission. The form shall list the amount of currency and coin and give a description and count of personal items. The intake receipt shall give the inmate's name, identification number, date, and the signature of the intake employee. The inmate shall also sign the receipt to confirm the accuracy of the money and property as listed on the receipt.
 - i. Original intake receipt shall be given to the trust office.
 - ii. —
 - iii. Third copy of the receipt shall be given to the inmate.
 - b. At the end of the intake employee's tour of duty, a cash summary report shall be prepared which lists the total of cash received, balanced against the total amount of money shown on the pre-numbered intake receipts issued for that shift. All receipt numbers shall be accounted for with copies of voided receipts attached. The cash summary report shall bear the signature of the intake employee, the shift and date.
 - i. Original intake receipt, cash and cash summary report shall be placed in the trust office safe.

GENERAL ORDER 4.1

INTERNAL INVESTIGATIONS, in it's entirety, including but not limited to, the following subparts:

III. REQUIREMENTS

- A. Guidelines for **SERIOUS MISCONDUCT** include, but not limited to:

17. Engage in any conduct unbecoming an employee of the Cook County Department of Corrections, which tends to reflect discredit on the Department of Corrections or Sheriff's Office.

18. Making a false official report, either oral or written.

SHERIFF'S ORDER 11.2.20.0

RULES OF CONDUCT, in its entirety, including but not limited to, the following subparts:

II. POLICY

The CCSO serves the citizens of Cook County by performing law enforcement functions in a professional manner, and it is to these citizens that the CCSO is ultimately responsible. Employees of the CCSO shall conduct themselves in a professional and ethical manner both on and off duty. Employees shall not engage in activities that reflect unfavorably on the CCSO but shall instead serve to further the mission of service.

VI. RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR ALL SWORN AND CIVILIAN CCSO EMPLOYEES

A. Compliance with Laws, Ordinances, and Regulations

2. Employees shall comply with lawful rules, Sheriff's Office written directives, verbal orders, SEAM articles, and political prohibitions issued by the proper authorities.

D. Prohibited associations, establishments, and activities.

CCSO employees shall not:

25. Fail to cooperate or fail to be truthful with external and/or internal agencies in an investigation of a criminal or civil matter.

H. Reporting violations.

4. Employees are prohibited from making a false report, written or oral.

COOK COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT MERIT BOARD RULES AND REGULATIONS, in its entirety, including but not limited to, the following subparts:

Article X, Paragraph B

No Police Officer of the Cook County Sheriff's Police Department, nor any Correctional Officer of the Cook County Department of Corrections, nor any Deputy Sheriff of the Cook County Sheriff's Court Services Department shall:

3. violate any of the general orders, special orders, directives or rules and regulations of the CCSO.

Issues Presented:

Whether the actions of the Respondent violated any of the General Orders and Rules and Regulations set forth above and what if any discipline is appropriate if a violation occurred.

Evidence Presented:

A hearing was conducted on September 24, 2014 at the Cook County Administration Building, 69 W. Washington Street, Room 1100, Chicago, Illinois. Present were Assistant State's Attorney [REDACTED] and Assistant General Counsel [REDACTED] on behalf of the Cook County Sheriff and Attorney [REDACTED] on behalf of the Respondent.

The following exhibits were admitted into evidence:

Sheriff Exhibit 1 – General Order – Inmate Trust Fund Accounting
Sheriff Exhibit 2 – Detainee Grievance letter from [REDACTED]
Sheriff Exhibit 3 – CCDOC Incident Report prepared by [REDACTED]
Sheriff Exhibit 4 – CCDOC Daily Receiving Room Cash Summary Report
Sheriff Exhibit 5 – Personal Property Receipt from CPD for [REDACTED]
Sheriff Exhibit 6 – CCDOC Personal Property receipt [REDACTED]
Sheriff Exhibit 7 – CCDOC Personal Property receipt [REDACTED]
Sheriff Exhibit 8 – Complaint Register filed by [REDACTED]
Sheriff Exhibit 9 – CCDOC Cash Drawer Count for Trust 2
Sheriff Exhibit 10 – CCDOC Cash Drawer Count for Trust 6
Sheriff Exhibit 11 – Transfer letter for Toccara Wilson dated 9-29-11
Sheriff Exhibit 12 – Toccara Wilson's statement made to OPR dated 6-5-13
Sheriff Exhibit 13 – Sheriff's Order – Rules of Conduct
Sheriff Exhibit 14 – General Order 4.1 A – Internal Investigations
Sheriff Exhibit 15 – General Order 4.1 – Internal Investigations
Sheriff Exhibit 16 – Booking Card for [REDACTED]

Exhibits not moved into evidence:

Sheriff Exhibit 17 – Summary of statement made by [REDACTED] to OPR

The following witnesses testified for the Sheriff:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that she had been employed by the Cook County Sheriff's Department for 19 years. Her current assignment is at the Records Department as the Superintendent for the past 2 years. Prior to that, she was at RCDC also known as Receiving as the Commander for 10 to 12 years. Under RCDC, there are Classification and Trust Departments.

In 2011, RCDC was located in Division 5 basement with 4 windows in a caged area. The duties of the trust officers were to receive properties from transportation and inventory the property and money. The duties of the supervisors in RCDC were to verify the bank of each trust officers, sign appropriate paperwork, make sure the money was sealed in a bag, and dropped the money in a locked safe. [REDACTED] stated that she started in RCDC as a lieutenant and occasionally verified trust officers' bank at the end of the night but this was usually done by the sergeants on duty.

[REDACTED] explained that properties came in either from transportation or from the criminal court buildings. She described the property bags as being clear plastic sealed at the top portion with a separate sealed area inside for money and receipts for the property.

[REDACTED] explained that a trust officer started his/her shift with an empty cash box. The trust officer called the detainee up to his/her window, opened the sealed bag that matched the detainee, counted the money, entered the information into the IMAC system, generated a receipt signed by both detainee and officer. IMAC was the program that CCDOC used for jail management system that was instituted in 2009 and IMAC receipts became available in 2010. Sheriff's Exhibit 1 was the General Order for Trust Fund Accounting that applied to all trust officers which contained procedures for accounting process. [REDACTED] implemented a system whereby each trust officer signed out a batch of 100 manual receipts from her so that each trust officer was accountable for his/her batch. This was in place since 2008 because of Officer [REDACTED] who stole money from inmates. At the end of the night, the manual receipts that were not used were placed in a sealed property bag and placed in a locked cabinet. If a receipt was voided, the trust officer initialed it, notified a supervisor, attached it to the cash summary report, and turned over to the Trust Department.

Sometime in September 2011, [REDACTED] received a grievance letter (Sheriff's Exhibit 2) from an inmate name [REDACTED] (herein after "[REDACTED]") from Superintendent [REDACTED]. After receiving the grievance letter, [REDACTED] spoke to [REDACTED] at the Finance Department and learned and received a document (Sheriff's Exhibit 10) that indicated \$39 was placed in [REDACTED] account on July 19, 2011. [REDACTED] then retrieved [REDACTED] property bag and found a receipt from Officer Wilson of the Chicago Police Department indicating \$69 (Sheriff's Exhibit 5) and CCDOC receipt no. [REDACTED] that indicated \$69, ID, Belt, and laces (Sheriff's Exhibit 7). CCDOC receipt no. [REDACTED] (Sheriff's Exhibit 6) with \$39 was not inside [REDACTED] property bag. [REDACTED] then prepared an incident report to reflect her findings (Sheriff's Exhibit 3) and notified Superintendent [REDACTED]. She then filed a register complaint with OPR (Sheriff's Exhibit 8).

[REDACTED] explained that in July 2011, IMAC was utilized but there was no IMAC receipt for [REDACTED]. Sheriff's Exhibit 9 was a stack of paper that contained two pages of summary report from the Finance Department, one page of receiving room cash summary, a voided receipt no. [REDACTED], and IMAC property receipts dated July 18, 2011 for Respondent [REDACTED].

After the investigation, [REDACTED] made a recommendation to transfer Respondent to Division 11. Sheriff's Exhibit 11 was the transfer letter regarding Respondent dated September 29, 2011 authorized by Director [REDACTED].

On cross-examination, [REDACTED] testified that the system of assigning a batch of manual receipts or IMAC program was not contained in the General Order. [REDACTED] stated that whenever there was a change in the trust department, she informed the officers through roll calls or memos. She did not remember if she had worked on July 18, 2011. She did not investigate who the supervisor was on July 18, 2011 in RCDC. She did not recognize the supervisor's signature on

the cash summary report (Sheriff's Exhibit 4) generated by Respondent. [REDACTED] believed that they had between 250 to 300 inmates processed daily by four to five trust officers. She admitted that trust officer's position was a bided position and that there was no formal training for it.

On re-direct examination, [REDACTED] stated that General Order 2.3 provided that a trust officer must attach all voided receipt to the cash summary report at the end of the night. Respondent had two separate receipts with two different amounts for the same inmate but failed to attach one of the receipts as a voided receipt to the cash summary report. She explained that a receipt cannot contain a mistake. The receipt with a mistake must be voided. The trust officer then had to contact a supervisor and attach the voided receipt to the cash summary report.

On re-cross examination, [REDACTED] admitted that the General Order 2.3 did not state that a trust officer must notify a supervisor when a mistake was made on the receipt. [REDACTED] stated that she was present when Officer [REDACTED] was processed at RCDC after being charged with stealing money from inmates.

[REDACTED]

On direct examination, [REDACTED] (herein after "[REDACTED]") testified that he worked as an investigator at OPR. He had been there for approximately 1 ½ years. He received B.S. from West Virginia in forensics/investigative science and psychology. He is currently working to obtain MBA degree. His prior experience was in the areas of fingerprints and handwritings. He was assigned to this matter by Director [REDACTED] and received a complaint register written by Superintendent [REDACTED] along with an incident report. During his investigation, [REDACTED] reviewed a grievance filed by an inmate [REDACTED] receipts from CPD and CCDOC, and interviewed [REDACTED] and Respondent. [REDACTED] interviewed [REDACTED] but only after he had submitted his written report. He did not find any inconsistency from [REDACTED] interview and his report. He did not submit additional report after interviewing [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that he reviewed General Order 2.3 Inmate Trust Fund and 4.1A Internal Investigations.

[REDACTED] interviewed Respondent at the south campus of the CCDOC, building 2, 4th floor. Respondent was present along with a union rep [REDACTED] who was replaced by [REDACTED] during the interview, and Investigator [REDACTED]. The interview was reduced to a written statement (Sheriff's Exhibit 12) which was signed by all parties. During the interview, Respondent stated the following: (1) that it was typical to make mistakes on the receipts; (2) that she had made a mistake counting [REDACTED] money and that was the reason why she had created a second receipt; (3) that there were no procedures to correct the mistake and no way to void the receipt; (4) that she had created a separate cash summary report only for [REDACTED] because he came late during her shift after she had already created a cash summary report for all other inmates that she processed; (5) that it was normal to have detainees allege that they were credited with lesser money; (6) that receipts from outside agencies were typically incorrect; (7) that she did not notify anyone of the discrepancy in money; and (8) that the correct receipt she prepared was for a lesser amount of money.

[REDACTED] made a finding that the signatures on the grievance letter and receipt no. [REDACTED] were consistent but not with the signature on receipt no. [REDACTED]. He found that [REDACTED] had been processed around 3 pm and not late as Respondent had claimed. [REDACTED] stated that during the interview, Respondent wanted a full investigation on [REDACTED] for how she was removed from RCDC. Respondent told him that she had a conversation with [REDACTED] on the date of the incident and received a text message next day informing her to report to Division 11 the following day.

Respondent did not know who had sent her the text but that she received it on July 19, 2011. [REDACTED] stated that he found a letter in Respondent's file that indicated that Respondent was transferred to Division 11 on September 29, 2011.

Additionally, [REDACTED] interviewed [REDACTED] and reduced it to a written statement. [REDACTED] was not required to sign off on the statement.

[REDACTED] believed that Respondent made false statement to him regarding Respondent's transfer from RCDC to Division 11, false statement regarding the amount of money detainee [REDACTED] had when processed, false statement on how to deal with voided receipt, and created false documents with receipts that discredited CCDOC. [REDACTED] sustained the complaint and his supervisor recommended termination.

On cross-examination, [REDACTED] stated that he had only been with OPR for 6 months prior to being assigned to this matter. After submitting his report, [REDACTED] interviewed [REDACTED]. He did not have [REDACTED] identify signatures on receipts no [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] nor have him sign his name so that a comparison could be made. [REDACTED] said that the Respondent's statement was not verbatim but accurate recollection of Respondent's answers to his questions. [REDACTED] agreed that Respondent did not have a right to remain silent during the interview and that he had the authority to order her to answer his questions. [REDACTED] said that Respondent informed him that she had reported to her supervisor about her mistake. [REDACTED] did not investigate who the supervisor was on the date of the incident. [REDACTED] relied on General Order 2.3 that required all receipts to be accounted and that voided receipts must be attached to the cash summary report. [REDACTED] stated that he marked [REDACTED] as AWOL in his report because he was unable to interview [REDACTED] prior to completing his written report. [REDACTED] was assigned to investigate this matter sometime in 2013 after 2 years from the incident. He did not know why there was a delay.

On re-direct examination, [REDACTED] said that Respondent's Exhibit 1 indicated that [REDACTED] was processed at 3:50 pm. [REDACTED] said that Respondent told him that the reason she prepared a separate cash summary report for [REDACTED] only was because he came in late. [REDACTED] believed that all of his questions to Respondent were clear.

The following testified for the Respondent:

[REDACTED]

On direct-examination, [REDACTED] (herein after "[REDACTED]") testified that she has been working for the Cook County Sheriff's Office for 22 years. She is currently a Lieutenant assigned to RCDC working 2 to 10 shift. She started at RCDC as a sergeant in 2008 until 2013. She left RCDC sometime in 2013 but came back when she was promoted on August 28, 2013.

She explained that she started as a sergeant in RCDC and took turns with other sergeants in counting trust officers' bank at the end of the night. [REDACTED] did not have a formal training prior to working in RCDC as a supervisor. [REDACTED] did receive a copy of the General Order 2.3 but was not familiar with it. She said that whenever there was a problem, everyone tried to figure out how to fix it since there were no policies to deal with it. As a sergeant in RCDC, she encountered trust officers making mistakes. [REDACTED] had the ability to discipline subordinates but she tried to resolve the problem prior to instituting a discipline.

[REDACTED] stated that whenever a trust officer made mistake filling out a receipt, he/she was required to write "void" and the reason for being voided on the receipt; call a supervisor to

report the mistake; and attach the voided receipt to the cash summary report. The mistake on the receipt could be wrong inmate, wrong cash amount, or wrong ID number. [REDACTED] further stated that it was not a violation to have two cash summary report for one night and that it was trust officer's discretion to divide his/her bank. She had never experienced an incident where a trust officer did not attach voided receipt to the cash summary report where there was a mistake.

[REDACTED] explained the process in RCDC. She stated that there were 3 windows in RCDC where the trust officers are placed; that when a trust officer says "next", an inmate was directed by a correctional officer in the bullpen to a window; that the trust officer obtained the number on the inmate's hand to match the number on the property bag; that trust officer asked for the name and number again to double check for right property to the right inmate; that if the property contained money then he/she would open the bag in front of the inmate to ascertain the correct amount; that the money was counted in front of the inmate; that if IMAC was used, the trust officer printed 3 copies of the receipt signed all 3 copies by the trust officer and inmate; that if a manual receipt was used, the receipt was in a triplicate (white, yellow, pink) form signed by the trust officer and inmate.

At the end of the night, if a trust officer's bank did not add up, [REDACTED] would go through every receipt with the trust officer to ascertain where the mistake occurred.

On cross-examination, [REDACTED] testified that she wrote incident reports when she noticed subordinates doing something wrong. If subordinate violated General Order she was required to institute disciplinary action. Sheriff's Exhibit 13 was effective on January 25, 2013 which was superseded by General Order 3.8 regarding responsibilities of supervisors. [REDACTED] said that they were the same. [REDACTED] explained that when it came to manual receipts, supervisors did not touch them because the trust officers were assigned to receipts in a batch.

On re-direct examination, [REDACTED] said that the trust officers were assigned to manual receipts from Lieutenant [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. There was only one lieutenant at a time assigned to RCDC. [REDACTED] did not remember if she had worked on July 18, 2011.

On re-cross examination, [REDACTED] said that she worked 2 to 10 shift while at RCDC.

TOCARRA WILSON:

On direct examination, Respondent testified that she had been working for the CCDOC for almost 10 years. Prior to CCDOC, she worked as a school secretary but never as an accountant. She was not educated in accounting and had never worked for the banks. Currently, she works at Division 11 from 7 to 3 shifts with Wednesdays and Thursdays off.

Respondent stated that she worked in RCDC sometime in 2010 to late 2011. She did not remember working in RCDC on July 18, 2011 until OPR informed her. Prior to starting at RCDC, Respondent stated that she did not receive training or any standard of operating procedures. She learned her duties by following her peers. She described the whole process as being chaotic, hectic, and lots of yelling and screaming. Respondent explained that she was not assigned to a batch of manual receipts but that whenever she was low in receipts, she would replenish it from [REDACTED]'s office. She did not know which inmates would be assigned to her to process. She said 5 inmates would line up at each windows, she would look at the inmate's hand to find the number that matched with a property bag that the inmate came in with, open the seal bag in front of the inmate only if cash was in it, count the money in front of the inmate, generate a manual receipt or IMAC receipt. She and her co-workers usually processed 250 to 300 inmates daily. Respondent said that she made mistakes more than one occasion by writing a wrong

amount of money. When this happened, she would call the supervisor and the supervisor told her what to do. Sometimes, the supervisor had her do a voided receipt and at other times, the supervisor wrote an incident report with Respondent's signature on it. She did not know the procedure to deal with mistakes she had made at RCDC.

Respondent stated that she did not have an independent recollection of what happened on July 18, 2011 with regards to detainee [REDACTED]. She did know about the inmate's grievance letter from [REDACTED] prior to being transferred to Division 11. Respondent said that [REDACTED] informed her about it and told her that she would show it to her the next day. Respondent stated that [REDACTED] never showed her the grievance letter but received a text from someone informing her to report to Division 11 for 3 to 11 shift the following day. She did not know who had texted her. Respondent stated that an interview took place on June 5, 2013 by an investigator from OPR. She was given her administrative rights and treated as an accused. She stated that she answered all questions truthfully and that she believed that she had given [REDACTED] too much money since there were two receipts for the same inmate on the same date. She did remember reporting her mistake to a supervisor but she did not remember who her supervisor was on July 18, 2011. Respondent explained that she did not do a voided receipt or write up an incident report because she was not instructed to do so by her supervisor. Respondent stated that she did not falsely report to OPR about [REDACTED] signing the 2nd receipt (Sheriff's Exhibit 6); that she did not make any false report to OPR; that she did not receive any discipline for this incident or any other incident at RCDC; that she did not take any money from [REDACTED] that she did not destroy any receipts; that she had given all receipts to her supervisor at the end of the night; that a manual receipt was used for [REDACTED] because IMAC could not do voided receipts; and that she had signed off on the OPR statement because she did not want to get into trouble.

On cross-examination, Respondent testified that she had never been disciplined at work. She did not remember being disciplined for unsatisfactory work performance on March 5, 2009 or desertion on May 28, 2013.

Respondent stated that she recognized her signature on the cash summary reports for July 18, 2011. She explained that when she wrote the receipts, there were three copies: one went to the inmate, second placed inside the property bag, and the last went to the supervisor at the end of the night. She further explained that she created tapes by tallying up all the receipts as she was processing the inmates. She then compared the total amount on the tapes to the money in her cash box. She stated that when she made mistakes and was unable to reconcile, her supervisor reconciled and found the mistake. She said that she did not mark voided on the receipt no. [REDACTED] or attached it to the cash summary report because she was not told to do so by her supervisor. After taking back the yellow copy of the receipt no. [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] she wrote out receipt no. [REDACTED] without having [REDACTED] present. She explained that she was unable to give [REDACTED] receipt no. [REDACTED] because it was around 8:30 pm and he was no longer in the lock up. She was also unable to place receipt no. [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] property bag because the bag was no longer in the processing area. She claimed that she gave all the documents to her supervisor to make the final assessment. Respondent admitted that she did attach a voided receipt no. [REDACTED] to her cash summary report on the date of this incident. It was her practice to attach voided receipts to cash summary report.

Respondent did not remember why or how but she remembered that it was the [REDACTED] receipt that she had made mistake on July 18, 2011. All the inmates that Respondent processed on July 18, 2011 were processed on IMAC with IMAC receipts except for [REDACTED]. Respondent did not understand why [REDACTED] did not have IMAC receipt.

The following testified in rebuttal:

██████████

On direct- examination, ██████████ said that she had testified earlier that she had not spoken to OPR. But after seeing the Investigator ██████████ she remembered. Sheriff Exhibit 17 was a summary of the statement that she had made to OPR. ██████████ remembered telling OPR that Respondent did not generate IMAC receipt for ██████████ that it was trust officer's duty to reconcile his/her bank and not the supervisor; that supervisor was only called when there was a discrepancy; that it was the officer's responsibility to find the discrepancy and balance his/her drawer; that supervisors did not fix officer's mistakes; and that when Respondent created 2 receipts for the same inmate, Respondent should have voided out the first receipt and attached it to the cash summary report.

On cross- examination, ██████████ testified that no one had told her that she had met with ██████████ but that she had remembered when she saw him. She did not remember the date she met with ██████████ but she did remember meeting him in person at the OPR's office on the 31st Street. She stated that she knew Respondent did not create IMAC receipt for ██████████ because if she had, it would have been saved in the program. ██████████ acknowledged that when an officer asked for help, it was supervisor's responsibility to help, and that the officer was relying on the supervisor's guidance. ██████████ did not recall who the supervisor was on July 18, 2011 and therefore, she did not speak to the supervisor. ██████████ denied speaking to Respondent about this incident.

Findings/Conclusion of the Law:

Based on the evidence presented, and after assessing the credibility of witnesses and the weight given to the evidence including all the exhibits that were admitted, the Board finds that Respondent violated General Order 2.3 II E 1 a and b; General Order 4.1 A 17 and 18; Sheriff's Order 11.2.20.0 II and VI A, D and H; and Merit Board Rules and Regulations Article X, Paragraph B.

The Board finds that Superintendent ██████████ and Investigator ██████████ were credible in their testimony. The Board further finds that Respondent was not credible and not believable in her testimony.

██████████ received ██████████ grievance letter stating that he had a receipt for \$69 but only \$39 was placed in his account. ██████████ investigated the allegation by determining how much was placed in ██████████ trust account. She was informed by the Finance Department that \$39 was placed in ██████████ account. She then retrieved ██████████ property bag that had a receipt from the Chicago Police Department stating that he had \$69. She then looked into IMAC system to ascertain whether Respondent used IMAC to generate receipts on July 18, 2011. ██████████ learned that Respondent used IMAC or created IMAC receipts for all the inmates that she processed except for ██████████ on July 18, 2011. ██████████ then found two receipts from CCDOC that were created by Respondent for ██████████ for \$69 and \$39. After gathering information, ██████████ wrote out an incident report and a complaint register. ██████████ then recommended that Respondent be transferred out of RCDC.

Investigator [REDACTED] was assigned to this case by his Director and received a copy of the incident report and complaint register. He then obtained a copy of [REDACTED] grievance letter along with copies of all the receipts. [REDACTED] interviewed Respondent on June 5, 2013 and [REDACTED]. Based on his training and experience, he believed that the signatures on the grievance letter and the 1st receipt (no. [REDACTED]) were consistent but not the 2nd receipt (no. [REDACTED]). [REDACTED] testified that Respondent told him that she had made a mistake when she gave [REDACTED] too much money and that there was no way to voided out a receipt even though she had a different voided receipt (no. [REDACTED]) attached to her cash summary report on the same day. [REDACTED] further testified that Respondent informed him that [REDACTED] had talk to her about this incident on the date of the incident and that she had received a text message from an unknown supervisor the following day informing her to report to Division 11 instead of RCDC. The Board finds that Respondent was untruthful when she told [REDACTED] about having a conversation about this incident with [REDACTED] on the date of the incident and being transferred the following day when in reality, transfer did not happen until September 29, 2011.

Respondent's own witness, Lieutenant [REDACTED] corroborated the Sheriff's position that all voided receipts were required to be attached to the cash summary report. She stated that she had never experienced an incident where a trust officer did not attach voided receipt to the cash summary report where there was a mistake. By Respondent's own account, she testified that it was her practice to attach voided receipts to the cash summary report at the end of the date. She further stated that she did not attach the 1st receipt (no. [REDACTED]) to the cash summary report because she was not told to do so by her supervisor. This statement is not believable since on the same date, she had a voided receipt (no. [REDACTED]) that was attached to the cash summary report.

The Board finds that Respondent violated General Orders when she created 2nd receipt for the inmate [REDACTED] without having him present; when she failed to give inmate [REDACTED] the 2nd receipt; when she failed to place the 2nd receipt in [REDACTED] property bag; when she failed to attach the 1st receipt to her cash summary report as a voided receipt; when she made false reports by creating two receipts for the same inmate on the same date; and when she failed to be truthful during the investigation.

Order:

Wherefore, based on the foregoing, it is hereby ordered that the Respondent Tocarra Wilson be separated from the employment of the Cook County Sheriff's Office effective April 18, 2014.

Tocarra Wilson #1761


JAMES P. NALLY, Chairman


BYRON BRAZIER, Vice-Chairman


BRIAN RIORDAN, Board Member


JOHN J. DALICANDRO, Secretary


KIM R. WIDUP, Board Member


JOHN R. ROSALES, Board Member


VINCENT T. WINTERS, Board Member


JENNIFER E. BAE, Board Member

Dated: March 5, 2015